



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

January 2022

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level
In Spanish (WSP03)
Paper 01: Understanding and Spoken Response

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

January 2022

Publications Code WSP03_01_2201_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Format of the test

The assessment for this unit is divided into two sections and lasts between 11 and 13 minutes.

The first section is a debate and requires candidates to present and to take a clear stance on any issue of their choice. The examiner then plays devil's advocate, adopts the opposite view to the candidate, and provides strong and meaningful challenges to allow candidates to defend their views and use the language of debate and argument.

At the end of section one, the examiner indicates that the examination moves to the second part of the test, moving away from the debate in part one to the discussion in part two.

In this second part of the examination, candidates must demonstrate their ability to engage in a natural, unpredictable (but not unfamiliar) and meaningful discussion of two or three follow-up issues. The examiner should encourage the candidate to express their views on the issues raised during this section.

Candidates are expected to interact effectively with the teacher-examiner, defend their views, and sustain discussion as the teacher-examiner moves the conversation away from the chosen issue. Centres are reminded that the test examines the candidate's ability to use language spontaneously in largely unpredictable circumstances.

Assessment Principles

The test is assessed positively out of 40.

Spontaneity and development - 20 marks

- Is the discourse spontaneous, and to what extent?

Discourse is the exchange of opinion and information on an issue between the candidate and the examiner, developing the line of argument and exploring it in more depth. In practice, this means that each participant addresses the points made by the other, responding appropriately to each other's input, whether that be a question, a comment, or a remark.

Candidates will score well here if the test is a genuine discourse and not a sequence of questions and answers covering many topics.

There should also be evidence of challenging questions required to demonstrate that candidates have engaged in a discussion and debate at an appropriate intellectual level for A-Level.

- Are the responses well developed? Can candidates respond demonstrating understanding?

Can candidates independently sustain the development of ideas? Can candidates develop the discussion by offering longer contributions that lead to further paths for development? Development is appropriately expanding on an idea and point of view. This can be in the form of justification, illustration, exemplification, clarification, comparison of the candidate's ideas and views.

Quality of Language – Accuracy 5 marks

This box assesses the accuracy of language, pronunciation, and intonation.

Quality of Language – Range 5 marks

Does the candidate have a good range of lexis and sentence structures appropriate to the issues discussed? Is the language authentically used?

Reading and research - 5 marks

This box only assesses the candidate's level of research and awareness of the chosen issue for debate. Candidates need to undertake thorough research into their chosen issue to be able to formulate their opinion, justify their arguments and give examples to illustrate their answers.

To access the top mark bands (4 and 5), candidates will have to mention target language newspaper and magazine articles, online sources, or any other suitable target language written source that they have used.

Critical analysis- 5 marks

On this part, candidates are assessed on their ability to handle abstract concepts, not purely concrete exchanges. There will be a critical analysis of key issues and justified links between ideas, with coherent arguments that show a developing individual response. There should be evidence of deeper thinking. The discussions should be about ideas, not purely factual, narrative, or descriptive.

For candidates to achieve the top mark band (5), the issues discussed related to the three specific IAL general topic areas must refer to the Spanish-speaking world.

The Marking Guidance for Oral Examiners can be found on the website in the course materials section.

Candidates' performance

Around 200 candidates took the exam this series. A majority of them were native or bilingual speakers.

It is very important for centres to remember that candidates in this test are closely related to and often dependent upon the way the examiner conducts the examination. The following observations from tests illustrate this point.

Some examiners did not challenge the candidates during the first part of the exam and conducted the initial issue as a knowledge test rather than a proper debate. As per the Marking Guidance for Oral Examiners, the appropriate marking principles were applied if the examiner did not challenge the candidate's stance.

Some examiners had prepared their challenging questions and followed their planned line of questioning, not responding to or picking up in any way what the candidates said. There was no sense of interaction/discourse between the examiner and candidate, and even though questions were often challenging, the discussion followed a question-and-answer format.

This lack of discourse and development did not allow the candidate to reach high marks for Spontaneity and development and Critical Analysis, as per the Marking Guidance for Oral Examiners.

Despite the above, it was pleasing to note that a majority of examiners conducted the test correctly. Also, a majority of candidates approached the test with confidence and responded readily and fluently to most questions asked. They were able to develop their replies without too much reliance on or prompting from the examiner.

The debate

The majority of candidates chose a suitable issue for their debate which meant they could interact effectively with the examiner, defend their views and use the language of debate, analysis, and argument. They also had a good command of lexis relevant to their area of debate.

The best candidates had researched their chosen issue, had anticipated counterarguments, and had sufficient evidence and knowledge to support their arguments.

Some less able candidates' performance relied on assertion, generalisations, or personal conviction to pull through and consequently all too often ran out of ideas and tended to repeat their arguments.

There were few cases where this part of the exam was not conducted as a debate. Instead, the examiner sought information from the candidate on their topic as a discussion.

In a majority of cases, candidates did not mention target language newspapers/magazines or written material that could be referenced. This meant that they were not able to access the top bands 4/5 for Reading and Research.

The discussion

Some excellent examining was heard from many centres where examiners asked probing questions in no more than two or three follow-up areas which allowed their candidates to produce the necessary detail and depth in their responses. All areas introduced for development followed a natural course in the ensuing discussion.

In this part of the examination, the better performing candidates were well informed and aware of current issues, expressed their opinions clearly, analysed and justified their points of view with examples or evidence, and developed their responses.

Sometimes, many unconnected topics were covered, and the examinations were more interviews than discussions which resulted in a Question-and-Answer session. This is not what is expected or required.

The follow-up areas for this part of the examination can be chosen from the General Topic Area for AS, as well as from the Additional General Topic Areas for A-Level (these must refer to the Spanish-speaking world).

AS topics visited at A Level should be considered in greater depth, and answers given to questions should clearly indicate progression from AS to A-Level. Sometimes, examiners conducted the first part of the exam (the debate) correctly. However, for the second part (the discussion), they asked AS-type questions or personal questions, thereby not giving the candidates any chance to develop their response appropriately for an A-Level exam.

Suitability of Topics/ Issues

The most successful issues tended to be those with a moral and/or ethical dimension, which had several possibilities for development. Some issues chosen for the debate were opinions rather than debatable points and, as such, could not create a meaningful argument.

The most popular issues were abortion, the legalisation of drugs, euthanasia, veganism, electric cars, and bullfighting.

Some other interesting issues presented were:

'En contra de la vacunación obligatoria' 'A favor del pasaporte COVID' 'A favor del feminismo' 'En contra de la reaccion del gobierno ante la pandemia' 'En contra del turismo de masas' 'A favor de la maternidad subrogada'

Unsuitable issues were those that were not arguable from both sides or ones where the candidate was simply expressing personal opinión, such as:

'No estoy de acuerdo con la gente racista' 'A favor de la tecnología'

Conduct of the examination

A majority of teacher-examiners conducted excellent tests. They asked clear, uncluttered, and yet challenging questions using a variety of structures and lexis. They listened to the detail of what their candidates said and followed their lead.

However, in a few cases, teacher-examiners spoke too much and asked long, and some quite convoluted questions interrupted/ corrected the candidate or dominated the exchange - this was to the disadvantage of their candidates.

Timing

The specification is clear about the timing required for the Unit 3 exam. In Part 1 - the debate, the candidate should introduce their stance for up to 1 minute, after which the examiner should interrupt, so the debate continues for a further 4 minutes before the examiner moves on to the discussion section (Part 2). The whole oral should last between 11 -13 minutes.

Centres are reminded here that it would be unnatural for any discussion to adhere precisely to the quoted timings as there needs to be a smooth transition from one topic to another. Nevertheless, the timings of the examination should remain as close as possible to those indicated in the specification.

In the cases where the tests were short, the appropriate marking principles were applied, as per the Marking Guidance for Oral Examiners, and resulted in a loss of marks. The examiner stopped listening at the end of the next sentence where tests were too long once 13 minutes had passed.

Teacher-Examiners

Advice and Guidance:

- Examiners need to observe the appropriate timing for both parts of the examination.
- Candidates must choose a controversial issue that easily lends itself to debate, and they must make sure it is phrased correctly 'Estoy a favor de..' 'Estoy en contra de..'.
- Candidates need to undertake research to provide supporting evidence for their arguments during the whole debate, not only during their presentation. They must also make sure that they mention the target written language sources they have used.
- Examiners should challenge the candidate's views so that they are given suitable opportunities to demonstrate their ability to argue their case and justify their opinion.
- Examiners should not introduce too many follow-up issues to allow the candidate to produce the depth of discussion and development of opinions.
- Examiners need to ask sufficiently complex and challenging questions to allow their candidates to access the full range of marks available for Spontaneity, Development, and Critical thinking. Please note that questions can be linguistically challenging or conceptually challenging. Complexity can be achieved through the response individual questions require.
- Candidates must show evidence of deeper thinking. Critical analysis of key issues and justified links between ideas should be substantiated with coherent arguments and insightful observations.
- To reach the top mark band (5) in Critical Analysis, the issues discussed in Section B, which relate to the three specific IAL general topic areas, must refer to the Spanish-speaking world.
- The candidate and the examiner should respond appropriately to each other's input; they must have a sense of interaction/discourse. The discussion should not follow a

question-and-answer format. For candidates to achieve the full range of marks in Spontaneity and Development, there should be frequent examples of spontaneous discourse.

- Examiners must make sure that the second part of the exam is not a re-run of Unit 1 oral test. For candidates to access the higher marks, they must show progression from AS to A2.
- Centres should not rotate the same two or three issues for all their candidates but rather personalise each examination for each candidate.
- Examiners should refer to the Marking Guidance for Oral Examiners for this unit.

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom

